

## 5 Structure of 2-transitive groups

**THEOREM 5.1** (*Burnside*) *Let  $G$  be a 2-transitive permutation group on a set  $\Omega$ . Then  $G$  possesses a unique minimal normal subgroup  $N$  and one of the two options occurs:*

1.  $N$  is regular, elementary abelian, and  $G$  is permutation isomorphic to a subgroup of an affine group  $\text{AGL}(d, \mathbb{Z}_p)$  acting naturally on  $\mathbb{Z}_p^d$  with  $G_\omega$  being a subgroup of  $\text{GL}(d, \mathbb{Z}_p)$  acting transitively on the non-zero vectors in  $\mathbb{Z}_p^d$ .
2.  $N$  is a non-abelian simple group acting primitively on  $\Omega$ .

**PROOF.** Let  $N$  be a minimal normal subgroup of  $G$ . Since  $N$  is a non-trivial normal subgroup of a primitive group, it is transitive. If  $N$  is not the unique minimal normal subgroup of  $G$ , then, by Theorem 4.6, the only other minimal normal subgroup is the centraliser  $C_G(N)$ , and both  $N$  and  $C_G(N)$  are regular non-abelian normal subgroups of  $G$ . However, a regular normal subgroup of a 2-transitive group is elementary abelian, a contradiction. This shows that  $N$  is the unique minimal normal subgroup of  $G$ .

If  $N$  is regular, then, as above, it is elementary abelian and (1) holds. Suppose thus that  $N$  is not regular.

Suppose first that  $N$  is imprimitive and let  $B$  be a minimal non-trivial block of imprimitivity for  $N$ . Let  $\mathcal{B} = \{B^g : g \in G\}$ . Since  $N$  is normal in  $G$ , each element of  $\mathcal{B}$  is a minimal block of imprimitivity for  $N$ . (Why?!) Since an intersection of two blocks is again a block, it follows that any two elements of  $\mathcal{B}$  intersect in at most one element.

Since  $B$  is not trivial, there exists two elements  $\omega, \delta \in B$ . Now take any  $\omega', \delta' \in \Omega$ . Since  $G$  is 2-transitive, there exist  $g \in G$  such that  $\omega^g = \omega'$  and  $\delta^g = \delta'$ , and thus  $\omega', \delta' \in B^g$ . Together with what we proved above, this shows that for any two elements of  $\omega, \delta \in \Omega$ , there exists a unique block in  $\mathcal{B}$  containing them; we shall denote this block by  $[\omega\delta]$ .

We will now show that  $N_{\omega\delta} = 1$  for any two  $\omega, \delta \in \Omega$ . Since each element of  $\mathcal{B}$  is a block of imprimitivity for  $N$ , it follows that  $N_\omega$  fixes (set-wise) every block through  $\omega$ . Now let  $g \in N_{\omega\delta}$  and let  $\gamma$  be an element of  $\Omega$  not contained in  $[\omega\delta]$ . Then  $N_{\omega\delta}$  fixes set-wise  $[\omega\gamma]$  as well as  $[\delta\gamma]$ , thus fixing their intersection, which is  $\gamma$ . In particular,  $N_{\omega\delta} \leq N_{\omega\gamma}$  for any  $\gamma \in \Omega \setminus [\omega\delta]$ . But then (by switching the roles of  $\gamma$  and  $\delta$ ), it follows that  $N_{\omega\gamma}$  (and thus also  $N_{\omega\delta}$ ) fixes every point not contained in  $[\omega\gamma]$ , and therefore every point on  $[\omega\delta]$ . In particular,  $N_{\omega\delta} = 1$ , as claimed.

We have thus shown that  $N$  is a Frobenius group. We could now use the Frobenius theorem to show that  $N$  contains a characteristic regular normal subgroup  $R$ , consisting of the identity and all fixed-point-free elements of  $N$ . Such a group would then be normal in  $G$ , and by minimality of  $N$ , we would have  $N = R$ , implying that  $N$  is regular itself, which contradicts our assumptions. Alternatively, to avoid appealing to the proof of the Frobenius theorem, we could continue in a more elementary way, which can be outlined as follows (you will be required to fill in details as a part of 2nd Assignment):

Let  $R^*$  be the set of all fixed-point-free elements of  $N$  and let  $R = R^* \cup \{1\}$ . Prove that  $|R| = n$ , where  $n = |\Omega|$ . Use this to argue that for any two  $\alpha, \beta \in \Omega$  there is a unique  $g \in R^*$  mapping  $\alpha$  to  $\beta$ . Now use 2-transitivity of  $G$  to conclude that all elements in  $R^*$  are conjugate within  $G$ . Now let  $p$  be a prime dividing  $n$ , and  $P$  a Sylow  $p$ -subgroup of  $N$ . Then  $P$  contains a fixed-point-free element of order  $p$ . So all elements in  $R^*$  have order  $p$ , and  $n$  is a power of  $p$ . Then it follows that  $P$  is transitive (why?), and so consists of the identity and all the elements in  $R^*$ ; in particular,  $P = R$ , and thus  $R$  is a regular normal subgroup of  $G$ . Since  $R$  is regular and  $G$  primitive,  $R$  is minimal, and thus  $N = R$ , a contradiction.

Either way, we proved that whenever  $N$  is imprimitive, it is regular, and thus part (1) holds. Suppose now that  $N$  is primitive but not regular. Being a minimal normal subgroup of  $G$ ,  $N = T_1 \times \dots \times T_k$ , where  $T_i$  are minimal normal subgroups of  $T$ , all isomorphic to some fixed normal non-abelian (why non-abelian?!) simple group  $T$ . On the other hand,  $N$  is primitive so either contains a unique minimal normal subgroup (and thus  $k = 1$ ) or it contains two distinct mutually centralising minimal normal subgroups—both regular (here  $k = 2$ ).

We are thus left with the case where the unique minimal normal subgroup  $N$  is a direct product  $T \times S$ , where  $T$  and  $S$  are isomorphic, both regular, they centralise each other and are non-abelian simple. Moreover, an element of  $G$  either normalises both  $S$  and  $T$  or conjugates one to the other. Let  $\tilde{G}$  be the normaliser of  $N$  in  $\text{Sym}(\Omega)$ . Then  $G \leq \tilde{G}$  and hence  $\tilde{G}$  is 2-transitive. By definition,  $N$  is normal in  $\tilde{G}$ , and since  $N$  is minimal normal in  $G$ , so it is in  $\tilde{G}$ . By what we showed,  $N$  is the unique minimal normal subgroup of  $\tilde{G}$ . Now let  $\tilde{H}$  be the normaliser of  $T$  in  $\tilde{G}$ ; note that  $\tilde{H}$  is the kernel of the action of  $\tilde{G}$  on  $\{T, S\}$  by conjugation and thus  $|\tilde{G} : \tilde{H}| = 2$ ; also  $N \leq \tilde{H}$ . Hence  $T$  is a regular normal subgroup in a primitive group  $\tilde{H}$ , hence, without loss of generality,  $\Omega = T$  and  $\tilde{H} \cong T \rtimes \tilde{H}_1$ , in its natural action on  $T$ . Now recall that  $S$  is the centraliser of  $T$  in  $\text{Sym}(\Omega) = \text{Sym}(T)$ . But the group  $L$  of permutations  $\lambda_g : t \mapsto g^{-1}t$ ,  $g \in T$ , also centralises  $T$  and acts regularly on

$T$ . Hence  $S = L$ , and thus  $N = L \times T$ . But the permutation  $\iota \in \text{Sym}(T)$ ,  $g \mapsto g^{-1}$ , conjugates  $S$  to  $L$  and vice versa, and thus belongs to  $\tilde{G} \setminus \tilde{H}$ . In particular,  $\tilde{G} = \langle \tilde{H}, \iota \rangle$ . Also, since  $\iota$  fixes  $1 \in T$ , it follows that  $\tilde{G}_1 = \langle \tilde{H}_1, \iota \rangle$ . Now, both  $\iota$  and elements of  $\tilde{H}_1$  preserve the order of elements in  $T$  (the latter being acting as conjugations), implying that  $\tilde{G}_1$  preserves the orders of elements in  $T$ . But  $\tilde{G}_1$  (being 2-transitive) acts transitively in  $T \setminus \{1\}$ , implying that  $T$  is an elementary abelian  $p$  groups, a contradiction.

## 6 Permutation groups of prime degree

**THEOREM 6.1** (*Burnside*) *Let  $G$  be a transitive permutation group on a set  $\Omega$  of prime size  $p$ . Then either  $G$  is doubly transitive or  $G$  is permutation isomorphic to a group  $\tilde{G}$  satisfying  $\mathbb{Z}_p \leq \tilde{G} \leq \text{AGL}(1, \mathbb{Z}_p)$ .*

Throughout this section, let  $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{Z}_p$ , the field of order  $p$ , and let  $\mathbb{F}^\Omega$  denote the set of all functions from  $\Omega$  to  $\mathbb{F}$ . If we endow  $\mathbb{F}^\Omega$  with the point-wise addition and multiplication with scalars from  $\mathbb{F}$ , it becomes an  $\mathbb{F}$ -vector space. For  $\omega \in \Omega$ , let  $\chi_\omega \in \mathbb{F}^\Omega$  be the characteristic function of  $\omega$ . Then  $\{\chi_\omega : \omega \in \Omega\}$  is clearly a basis for  $\mathbb{F}^\Omega$ .

Now let  $G$  act upon  $\mathbb{F}^\Omega$  according to the rule:

$$f^g(\omega) = f(\omega^{g^{-1}}), \text{ for all } f \in \mathbb{F}^\Omega, g \in G \text{ and } \omega \in \Omega.$$

Observe that for each  $g \in G$ , the mapping  $T_g: \mathbb{F}^\Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{F}^\Omega$ ,  $T_g: f \mapsto f^g$  is in fact an invertible linear transformation of the  $\mathbb{F}$ -vector space  $\mathbb{F}^\Omega$ . Moreover, the mapping  $G \mapsto \text{GL}(\mathbb{F}^\Omega)$ ,  $g \mapsto T_g$ , is an injective group homomorphism. In particular, by identifying  $g$  with  $T_g$ , we may view  $G$  as a subgroup of  $\text{GL}(\mathbb{F}^\Omega)$ . (CHECK ALL THIS!)

Further, let  $\text{Hom}(\mathbb{F}^\Omega, \mathbb{F}^\Omega)$  (denoted in short by  $\text{Hom}$ ) be the  $\mathbb{F}$ -linear space of all linear transformations of  $\mathbb{F}^\Omega$ , and let  $\text{Hom}_G(\mathbb{F}^\Omega, \mathbb{F}^\Omega)$  (denoted in short by  $\text{Hom}_G$ ) be the set of all those  $\varphi \in \text{Hom}$  that commute with every  $g \in G$ . That is,  $\varphi \in \text{Hom}_G$  if and only if  $\varphi(f)^g = \varphi(f^g)$  for every  $g \in G$  and  $f \in \mathbb{F}^\Omega$ . (CHECK THAT THIS IS INDEED A SUBSPACE OF  $\text{Hom}$ .)

Note (CHECK!) that for  $g \in G$  and  $\omega \in \Omega$ , we have

$$(\chi_\omega)^g = \chi_{\omega^g}$$

and deduce that, for a fixed  $\omega \in \Omega$ , the mapping  $\Phi: \text{Hom}_G \rightarrow \mathbb{F}^\Omega$ ,  $\Phi: \varphi \rightarrow \varphi(\chi_\omega)$  is injective and  $\mathbb{F}$ -linear. In particular, the dimension of  $\text{Hom}_G$  (as an  $\mathbb{F}$ -vector space) equals the dimension of the subspace  $\Phi(\text{Hom}_G)$  of  $\mathbb{F}^\Omega$ .

Now prove that  $f \in \Phi(\text{Hom}_G)$  if and only if  $f$  is constant on each  $G_\omega$ -orbit on  $\Omega$ . Use this to deduce the following lemma:

**LEMMA 6.2** *Let  $\omega \in \Omega$ . Then  $\dim_{\mathbb{F}} \text{Hom}_G$  equals the number of orbits of  $G_\omega$  on  $\Omega$ .*

We will also need the following lemma:

**LEMMA 6.3** *Let  $\mathbb{F}$  be a finite field of order  $p$ . Then, for every function  $f: \mathbb{F} \rightarrow \mathbb{F}$  there exists a unique polynomial  $\pi_f \in \mathbb{F}[x]$  of degree at most  $p-1$  such that  $\pi_f$  and  $f$  coincide as functions on  $\mathbb{F}$ .*

Let us now prove Burnside's theorem. The theorem clearly holds for  $p = 2$  and  $3$  (A WORD OF EXPLANATION). So we shall assume that  $p \geq 5$ .

Let  $g$  be an element of order  $p$  in  $G$  and let  $P = \langle \rho \rangle$  (PROVE THAT  $P$  is in fact the Sylow  $p$ -subgroup of  $G$ ). Since we want to determine the group  $G$  only up to permutation isomorphism, we may assume that  $\Omega = \mathbb{F}$  and  $\rho: \alpha \rightarrow \alpha - 1$  for every  $\alpha \in \mathbb{F}$ .

In view of Lemma 6.3, we may identify  $\mathbb{F}^{\mathbb{F}}$  by the  $\mathbb{F}$ -vector space  $\mathbb{F}_{p-1}[x]$  of polynomials of degree at most  $p - 1$ . In view of this identification, we may thus view  $\rho$  as the polynomial  $x - 1$ .

Recall that  $G$  can be viewed as a group of linear transformations of the vector space  $\mathbb{F}^{\Omega}$  ( $= \mathbb{F}^{\mathbb{F}} = \mathbb{F}_{p-1}[x]$ ). It thus makes sense to ask which subspaces of  $\mathbb{F}^{\Omega}$  are  $G$ -invariant (preserved by  $G$ ). In fact, in order to prove the theorem, we need to show that the subspace of linear transformations  $\mathbb{F}_1[x]$  is  $G$ -invariant. Indeed, if this is the case, then for an arbitrary  $g \in G$ , the  $g^{-1}$ -image of the polynomial  $\pi(x) = x$  is an element of  $\mathbb{F}_1[x]$ , and thus there exist  $c, d \in \mathbb{F}$  such that  $\pi^{g^{-1}}(x) = cx + d$ . If we evaluate this polynomial equality at an arbitrary  $\alpha \in \mathbb{F}$ , we see that  $\pi^{g^{-1}}(\alpha) = c\alpha + d$ . On the other hand, the left-hand side of the equality equals  $\pi(\alpha^g) = \alpha^g$ . We have thus shown that for every  $g \in G$ , there exist  $c, d \in \mathbb{F}$  such that  $g: \alpha \mapsto c\alpha + d$  for every  $\alpha \in \mathbb{F}$ . Since  $g$  is a permutation of  $\mathbb{F}$ , we see that  $c \neq 0$ , and the result follows.

The rest of the proof is thus devoted to the proof that the subspace  $\mathbb{F}_1[x]$  of  $\mathbb{F}_{p-1}[x]$  is  $G$ -invariant.

For  $r \in \{0, 1, \dots, p-1\}$ , let  $M_r = \mathbb{F}_r[x]$ . Let us first prove that the only non-trivial  $P$ -invariant subspaces of  $\mathbb{F}_{p-1}[x]$  are  $M_r$  for  $0 \leq r \leq p-1$ . To this end, introduce the  $\mathbb{F}$ -linear transformation

$$\Delta: \mathbb{F}_{p-1}[x] \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_{p-1}[x], \quad \Delta: f \mapsto f^\rho - f;$$

that is,  $(\Delta f)(x) = f(x+1) - f(x)$ . Now observe that, if  $f$  is of degree  $r$ , then  $\Delta f$  is of degree (exactly)  $r - 1$  (here the zero polynomial is treated as the polynomial of degree  $-1$ ). This implies (PROVIDE DETAILS) that every non-trivial  $\Delta$ -invariant subspace of  $\mathbb{F}_{p-1}[x]$  is one of  $M_r$ ,  $0 \leq r \leq p-1$ .

Now observe that  $\rho$  (as a linear transformation of  $\mathbb{F}_{p-1}[x]$ ) commutes with  $\Delta$  and that every  $P$ -invariant subspace is also  $\Delta$ -invariant (indeed, since  $\Delta = \rho - \text{id}$ ), implying that the  $P$ -invariant subspaces of  $M_{p-1}$  are precisely  $M_r$ , as claimed.

Now observe that  $M_{-1} = \langle 0 \rangle$ ,  $M_0$  (constants) and  $M_{p-1}$  are also  $G$ -invariant. Moreover,  $\{f \in \mathbb{F}_{p-1}[x] : \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{F}} f(\alpha) = 0\}$  is also a  $G$ -invariant

subspace of codimension 1 (and must thus equal  $M_{p-2}$ ).

Suppose now that for some  $r$ ,  $0 \leq r \leq p-3$ , both  $M_r$  and  $M_{r+1}$  are  $G$ -invariant. Then  $M_{r+1} : M_r = \{f \in \mathbb{F}_{p-1}[x] : fM_r \leq M_{r+1}\}$  (here the multiplication must be understood pointwise, that is, if the polynomials in  $fM_r$  that are of degree higher than  $p-1$  must be first interpreted as functions and then the corresponding polynomials of degree at most  $p-1$  must be found) is also  $G$ -invariant (CHECK!), and equals  $M_1$  (CHECK!). (WHY DOES THIS ARGUMENT FAIL WHEN  $r = p-2$ ?) Hence  $M_1$  is  $G$ -invariant and the result follows.

We shall now assume that  $G$  is not double transitive and show that such an  $r$  indeed exists. Take  $\varphi \in \text{Hom}_G$  and  $f \in \mathbb{F}_{p-1}[x]$ , and show that  $\varphi(\Delta f) = \Delta\varphi(f)$ .

Now suppose that there exists  $\varphi \in \text{Hom}_G$  such that  $\text{Im}(\varphi) = M_t$  for some  $t \in \{1, 2, \dots, p-2\}$ . Then let  $r = t-1$  and observe that  $\varphi(M_{p-2}) = \varphi(\Delta M_{p-1}) = \Delta\varphi(M_{p-1}) = \Delta M_t = M_r$ . Now, since  $\varphi$  (as an element of  $\text{Hom}_G$ ) maps  $G$ -invariant subspaces to  $G$ -invariant subspaces, both  $M_r$  and  $M_{r+1}$  are  $G$ -invariant, and the result follows.

To conclude the proof, it thus suffices to show that such a  $\varphi$  exists. To this end, take  $f \in \mathbb{F}_{p-1}[x]$  of degree precisely  $p-1$  (say  $f(x) = x^{p-1}$ ). Then  $\{f, \Delta f, \Delta^2 f, \dots, \Delta^{p-1} f\}$  forms a basis for  $\mathbb{F}_{p-1}[x]$ . Use this to show that  $\Psi: \text{Hom}_G \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_{p-1}[x]$ ,  $\varphi \mapsto \varphi(f)$ , is injective and  $\mathbb{F}$ -linear. Now recall that, since  $G$  is doubly transitive, we have  $\dim_{\mathbb{F}} \text{Hom}_G \geq 3$ . In particular,  $\text{Im}\Psi$  must contain a polynomial of degree  $t$  for some  $t \in \{1, \dots, p-2\}$  (WHY?). That is, there exists  $\varphi \in \text{Hom}_G$  such that  $\varphi(f)$  has degree  $t \in \{1, \dots, p-2\}$ . Since  $\varphi$  commutes with  $\Delta$  and since  $\mathbb{F}_{p-1}[x]$  is spanned by  $\{f, \Delta f, \Delta^2 f, \dots, \Delta^{p-1} f\}$ , it follows that  $\text{Im}\varphi$  is spanned by  $\{\varphi(f), \Delta\varphi(f), \Delta^2\varphi(f), \dots, \Delta^{p-1}\varphi(f)\}$ , and thus  $\text{Im}\varphi \leq M_t$ . But on the other hand,  $\text{Im}\varphi$  is a  $G$ -invariant subspace containing a polynomial of degree  $t$ , implying that  $\text{Im}\varphi = M_t$ . This proves the theorem.